

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 10 2004

OFFICIAL

**LAW OFFICES
STAAS & HALSEY LLP**

Telephone
(202) 434-1500

1201 New York Ave., N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005

Facsimile
(202) 434-1501

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

February 10, 2004

TO : U. S. Patent and Trademark Office

ATTN: Examiner Etienne Pierre LeRoux

FAX NO.: (703) 872-9306

TELEPHONE:

FROM: Richard A. Gollhofer

RE: U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/819,701

OUR DOCKET:

NO. OF PAGES (Including this Cover Sheet) 5

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, and is intended only for the use of the addressee(s). Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If there are any problems with this transmission, please contact us immediately.

COMMENTS:

Copy of Request for Reconsideration and Examiner Interview filed by Certificate of Mail on February 9, 2004 with Petition for one-month Extension of time.

3/2/2004 SCHMIDT 00000002 193935 09819701
C:1251 10.00 DA

#8 SS (NE)
2/13/04RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2171

Docket No.: 826.1722

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Naoya FUJISAKI

Serial No. 09/819,701

Group Art Unit: 2171

Confirmation No. 3142

Filed: March 29, 2001

Examiner: E. LEROUX

For: FILE SYSTEM ASSIGNING A SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTE TO A FILE, A FILE
MANAGEMENT METHOD ASSIGNING A SPECIFIC ATTRIBUTE TO A FILE, AND A
STORAGE MEDIUM ON WHICH IS RECORDED A PROGRAM FOR MANAGING
FILES

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attention: **BOX AF**

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed October 7, 2003, having a period for response set to expire on January 7, 2004. A Petition for a one-month extension of time, together with the requisite fee, is submitted herewith, making the period for response end on February 7, 2004.

In the October 7, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-17 were pending in the application; rejected claims 1-9, 11 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); and rejected claims 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 4,945,475 to Bruffey et al.; 5,564,119 to Krawchuk et al.; 5,764,972 to Crouse et al.; 5,778,389 to Pruett et al.; and 6,018,744 to Mamiya et al. were cited. Claims 1-17 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Serial No. 09/819,701

COPY

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

The rejection of the claims in items 2-7 on pages 2-5 of the October 7, 2003 Office Action was substantially identical to the rejection of the claims in the June 10, 2003 Office Action, except that "indicating a policy on which file management is based" was added on page 2, lines 10-11, and a few other words or letters were added or deleted. In short, the rejection was not modified in response to the arguments in the Amendment filed by certificate of mail on September 10, 2003 and received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on September 12, 2003.

The Response to Arguments in items 8-9 on pages 6-11 of the October 7, 2003 Office Action did little more than repeat the rejection set forth on pages 2-5. In response to the argument in the September 10, 2003 Amendment that Bruffey et al. contains no suggestion of storing "attribute data indicating a policy on which file management is based" (e.g., claim 1, lines 3-4) corresponding to "path information of a directory" (e.g., claim 1, line 4), column 3, lines 10-55, and column 6, lines 15-42 of Bruffey et al. were cited. In addition to quoting about 75 lines of the cited portions of Bruffey et al., the October 7, 2003 Office Action asserted that "at least Figure 2 which illustrates the architecture of the Hierarchical Filing System (HFS) of the present invention and as embodied in Figure 6 reads on the claim 1 limitation 'a setting unit setting policy attribute data indicating a policy on which file management is based.'" (Office Action, p. 7, lines 27-30).

First, it is noted that the above-quoted statement from the October 7, 2003 Office Action does not address the limitation quoted from claim 1, line 4 in the September 10, 2003 Amendment, and also quoted above. Taking claim 1 as an example, the setting unit does not merely set policy attribute data "indicating a policy on which file management is based," but it does so "in correspondence with path information of a directory". Second, it is also noted that the HFS discussed in the last full paragraph on page 7 of the Office Action is not part of the "present invention", i.e., the subject application, Serial No. 09/819,701, but rather what was disclosed in Bruffey et al.

More importantly, the Response to Arguments section of the October 7, 2003 Office Action did not provide an explanation of why the rejection was being maintained. The reasons may be clear to the Examiner, but they were not explained in the Office Action. The Applicant has no way of knowing what "policy" the Examiner sees in the cited portions of Bruffey et al., or how that policy is set "in correspondence with path information of a directory." As discussed in

Serial No. 09/819,701

the September 10, 2003 Amendment, nothing has been found by the Applicant in Bruffey et al. "suggesting the storage of any data as part of the root directory name and key or anywhere else that would indicate a policy on which file management is based" (Amendment, page 7, lines 22-23, emphasis added).

REQUEST FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW

As discussed during the telephonic Examiner Interview on February 9, 2004, the undersigned strongly believes that the most efficient way to provide an explanation of how Bruffey et al. meets the limitations recited in the claims and discussed in the September 10, 2003 Amendment would be an in-person Examiner Interview. The Applicant is willing to make further amendments to more clearly distinguish over Bruffey et al.; however, without a better understanding of what in Bruffey et al. needs to be distinguished it is impossible to make such amendments. Alternative language could be discussed at the Examiner Interview.

It is believed that continuing the examination of this application solely by communication in writing will result in extending the period of examination as the positions will become clear only in piecemeal fashion. The undersigned strongly believes that progress would be much faster if an in-person Examiner Interview is held, preferably before April 7, 2004, the end of the statutory period for response.

SUMMARY

For the reasons set forth in the September 10, 2003 Amendment which have not been rebutted by any explanation of how the prior art teaches the limitations recited in the independent claims, it is submitted that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-17 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Scheduling of an Examiner Interview and subsequent reconsideration of the claims are earnestly solicited.

COPY

Serial No. 09/819,701

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Request for Reconsideration, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/9/04

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

COPY

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 2/9/04
STAAS & HALSEY Richard A. Gollhofer
By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Date: 2/9/04